

9
A
1407
VINDICATION

O F

TRUTH *against* CRAFT;

I N

A N S W E R

T O T H E

DEFENCE *of the* CASE ^Kfairly stated:

I N A

L E T T E R

T O T H E

Author of said Case and Defence.

*Let no Man deceive you: He that doth Righteousness
is righteous.*

D U B L I N:

Printed in the Year M^{CC}CLIV.



A
VINDICATION
O F
TRUTH *against* CRAFT;
I N
A N S W E R
T O T H E
DEFENCE *of the* CASE fairly stated.

S I R,

IT is much to be feared, that the Measure you lately have taken, will, in the Issue, turn out a very unhappy Exception to the good old Observation, that 'Second Thoughts are best.' In the last Page of your marvelous *Defence of the Case fairly stated* against the Pamphlet intitled *Truth against Craft*, you acquaint the Public, that your first Resolution was, not to answer that Pamphlet; and truly, Sir, if the Writer of that Pamphlet doth not greatly mistake, it must have fared much better with your Character, in point of Morality, as well as of Discretion, if you had kept up to that Resolution.

Indeed, such was the favourable Opinion which your old Acquaintance continued to entertain of you, that he was far from thinking it a Matter impossible, that you might chuse openly and candidly to acknowledge your Mistake, in attempting to substitute an abstract Conceit in the Place of an undeniable Matter of Fact; and that, as it was impossible, after what had been so distinctly laid before you, that you should not be convinced, that the Sense, in which the Leaders of the Party contending for the Clause, was totally different from that which you had been contending for, and was, in reality, no other than what you had acknowledged to be destructive of the parliamentary Rights of this Kingdom; it did not seem unreasonable to hope, that a Sense of Duty would have constrained you to abandon the Defence of such Leaders and their Principles, and to have ranged yourself, in Pursuance of your own native Principles, on the Side of your Country; Principles so explicitly laid down in several Passages in your Book, as to afford the Materials of a compleat Demonstration, that, you yourself being Judge, ‘ the *House of Commons* ‘ had done nothing but what their Duty laid them ‘ under an indispensable Obligation of doing, in ‘ rejecting the Clause.’

But seeing, so far from answering this reasonable Expectation, you have not so much as suffered the Matter to rest in Silence, but, confiding in the Authority of your general Character, you have gone on still to mislead the Public, and to fix an Odium on the Men who delivered their Country; it is not the *angry Writer*, but only yourself and your Advisers, whom you have to blame, that it is now become necessary to demonstrate to the World, that you have forfeited
all

all Credit with the Public in regard to this Controversy: For, the Measure you have made choice of, being exactly correspondent with what was chosen by your Fellow-Labourer, the Author of the *Considerations*, in his notable *Defence*, Justice and Impartiality, and an honest Solitude, in a Cause of such Consequence to keep the Public from being misled, make it absolutely requisite, that your Treatment and his should not be different: At the same Time, if, without going again into an Argument, which must have appeared, to every fair and discerning Mind, utterly indefensible, you had contented yourself with making a lamentable Outcry about an Attack and Aspersions against your *moral Character*, which you most groundlessly, as shall be hereafter demonstrated, lay to the Charge of your Answerer, while the Fault was solely your own, the Controversy thus becoming personal, and thereby utterly unworthy of the Attention of the Public, your old Acquaintance would have saved himself this present most irksome and disagreeable Task, and been contented with pointing out in private, that the Charge was injurious and utterly absurd.

In the argumentative Part of your Defence, your principal Intention seems to have been to make the Publick believe the following Articles, namely, ‘ That the Author of TRUTH against CRAFT had really left the main Argument of the Pamphlet, which he undertook to refute, unanswered;’ affirming, that he had not taken the least Notice of *that Part of your Pamphlet, or shewn that you were wrong in your Reasoning on the Clause.* And secondly, That the principal Attempts which the Author of *Truth*, &c. had made to prove that the bad Sense of the Clause was the Sense in which it was understood by the Parties, were only these two; first, an arbitrary Assertion,
‘ That

‘ *That it was past all Doubt,*’ for thus our Author
 expresses himself in p. 8. ‘ *The principal Thing, He,*
 ‘ that is, the Writer of *Truth, &c. insisteth upon,*
 ‘ is, THAT IT IS A THING PAST ALL DOUBT,
 ‘ *that the Sense which he had put upon the Clause is*
 ‘ *the very Sense in which the Clause was universally*
 ‘ *understood by the House of Commons in the Day of*
 ‘ *the Debate, p. 21, 22.*’ And secondly, ano-
 ther Assertion; namely, ‘ that it had been
 ‘ shewn, in the Course of this Paper, that the
 ‘ Gentlemen, or, at least, the Leaders of the
 ‘ Gentlemen, who voted for passing that Clause,
 ‘ understood the Clause in the very same Sense
 ‘ with the Patriot Majority, by whose Votes the
 ‘ Clause was rejected,’ p. 39. and this you think
 it probable, that the Gentlemen concerned
 would not allow to be a fair Representation.
 These you expressly assert to be the principal
 Things which the Author of *Truth, &c.* had offered
 upon this Head. Under the Power of what
 Spirit you have attempted to put all this upon
 the Public for Truth, and as actually containing
 the Strength of your Antagonist’s Reasoning, will
 most properly be pointed out, after having, in a
 few Words, rehearsed the Plan which the Author
 of *Truth, &c.* pursued, in writing, what he
 intended for a compleat Refutation of your *Case*
fairly stated, and which he still apprehends to
 be, in all Respects, a most compleat Refutation.
 First he sets forth, in as distinct a Manner as he
 was able, the real Subject of Debate; with an
 Intention, that from thence it might instantly be
 seen ‘ how totally different, and how intirely
 ‘ besides the Purpose, was your fond Conceit,
 ‘ which, by dint of your Art in Reasoning, in
 ‘ direct Opposition to Fact and to Sense, you
 ‘ would needs have the World, at this Time of
 ‘ Day to consider, as the *Case fairly stated*; and
 ‘ next he proceeds to demonstrate from the whole
 ‘ Strain

‘ Strain of the Reasoning, and from the Prin-
 ‘ ciples acknowledged by you throughout your
 ‘ Pamphlet, that had you been so fortunate as to
 ‘ have understood the Point in Debate in the
 ‘ same Sense in which the contending Parties
 ‘ themselves understood it, and which, for that very
 ‘ Reason, must now, and for ever hereafter, be
 ‘ admitted as the only fair State of the Question,
 ‘ instead of an Adversary, we must have had
 ‘ you an Advocate for the Cause of your Coun-
 ‘ try; an Advocate on the same Principles, and
 ‘ for the same Reasons, with those very Writers
 ‘ whom you had set yourself, with so much lost
 ‘ Labour, and so preposterously, to refute,’ p. 9
 and 10 of *Truth against Craft*.

And now, Sir, notwithstanding all the late
 forbidding and astonishing Appearances, may I
 not still venture to appeal to yourself, whether
 this Plan was not, in all Respects, perfectly cor-
 respondent to all the Rules of fair and legitimate
 Reasoning? and, in case of its being properly filled
 up, whether it does not contain a compleat Refuta-
 tion of the whole Purpose of your Book? par-
 ticularly, whether proving, for Instance, that
 the real Question in Debate was a Matter totally
 distinct from your Sense of the Clause, is not a
 most significant and conclusive Manner of proving,
 that your Sense of the Clause was nothing to the
 Purpose; and whether proving that a Topic is
 nothing to the Purpose, and wholly remote from
 the Merits of an Argument, be not a thorough
 Refutation of such Topic in regard to that Argu-
 ment. Upon what Principle then could you allow
 yourself to assert, in p. 7. *That I had not taken*
the least Notice of that Part of your Pamphlet.
 And again, in p. 14. *That I had really left the main*
Argument of your Pamphlet, which I undertook to
refute, unanswered?

But

But this is not all; for having some Guess of your Genius, and in order, if possible, to prevent all such Subterfuges as the present, is it not, in *p.* 26. most distinctly pointed out, ‘ that the Commons had actually testified their Willingness to understand and approve of the Clause in your harmless Sense, so far and so long as the Nature and Circumstance of the Case would suffer it to wear so inoffensive a Colour, that so far as *Consent* was of the same Significance with *Recommend*, the Commons had frequently expressed their thankful Acknowledgments to his Majesty, for declaring, that he would, in this Sense, consent;’ concluding with the following Sentence, which ought to have made a lasting Impression. — “ After having had this Matter so directly under his Eye, it will be no easy Task to vindicate this solemn Gentleman from the Imputation of some very insidious Design, in representing, that the whole of the Debate was occasioned by the Patriots of this Country refusing to make this Acknowledgment, in this very Sense.” Again, under this Head, your old Acquaintance, in *p.* 40. expresses himself thus, ‘ You will not wonder, Sir, that seeing you thought proper to take such particular Notice of *the Remarks*, the Writer of them should wish to be informed, how it came to pass that you totally overlook’d the eighth and ninth Pages of the *Supplement*, where the whole of that Sense of the Clause, which you lay such Stress on, and represent to the Public, as the only *fair State of the Case*, was minutely discussed, and the Manner in which it came to be exploded, previous to the Debate on the 17th of *December*, circumstantially explained; Some Folks may be tempted

‘ to

‘ to think that this Oversight of yours must have
 ‘ been committed *through Design*, for had you
 ‘ condescended to take any fair Notice of this
 ‘ Article as it stands in this Paper, it would not
 ‘ be an easy Matter to assign any good Reason,
 ‘ that an old Notion, so thoroughly obsolete,
 ‘ should, at this Time of Day, under the Guise
 ‘ of a *new and fair State of the Case*, have been
 ‘ brought on the Stage.’

Is it possible for any rational Man to form a Belief, that an impartial Regard to Truth had the Direction of your Pen, when, having all this, and much more to the same Purpose, distinctly before your Mind, you at the same time assert, that your Answerer had not taken the least Notice of that Part of the Pamphlet, or shewn that you were wrong in your Reasoning on the Clause!

In the same Spirit you express yourself thus, in p. 5. of your Defence : ‘ The angry Gentleman, who has undertaken to answer the Case, has not thought fit to attempt to prove, either that the King hath not that Prerogative which is ascribed to him, or that the Clause was not proper to assert that Prerogative.’ Be pleased, now, Sir, to attend a little to the Nature of this Charge : You perfectly knew, that in the bad Sense of the Word ‘ Prerogative,’ corresponding to the bad Sense in which the Clause was understood by the Commons, the Burthen of all that the *angry Gentleman* had in the whole Course of his Writing been *attempting to prove*, was, that the King had no such Prerogative : In this Sense, therefore, it is manifest, that the Charge is absolutely false ; and in the harmless Sense of the Word, Prerogative, corresponding to the harmless Sense in which you were wanting to have the Clause understood, you likewise perfectly knew, that there could be no possible Occasion for his making any

B

such

such Attempt; as you yourself had fully acknowledged, that, in regard to this harmless Sense of the Word, he had, on the contrary, asserted his Majesty's Prerogative to your entire Satisfaction; declaring, *That the Account* he had given of his Majesty's Prerogative in the Remarks *appeared to you to be a very fair one*: See p. 12. of the *Case fairly stated*; so that, in this harmless Sense, the Charge is quite absurd.

But tho' the Articles already pointed out, are gross enough in themselves, yet must they appear trifling and harmless, compared with what are to follow. The only Thing, besides what has been already taken Notice of, that has the least Appearance of Argument in the argumentative Part of your Defence relative to the main Point in Debate, is, where you attempt to shew that I had failed to make good the Position, ' That the bad ' Sense of the Clause was the Sense in which it ' was understood by the House, in the Day of the ' Debate.' To support this Attempt, you pick out the two Assertions mentioned above, and expressly affirm, ' That these are the principal ' Things which the *Author of Truth, &c.* had ' offered upon this Head.'

And now, fair-minded Reader, be pleased to prepare to pronounce impartially betwixt this Gentleman and me, whether it is my *Bitterness and Passion*, or his own present unhappy Perversion of Mind, that unavoidably brings down Dishonour on his moral Character, so far as it can be affected by his Spirit, Temper, and Conduct, in the present Debate. That there are two such Propositions as this Gentleman has quoted, is not contested, but that, so far from being merely arbitrary or dogmatical Assertions, they are made use of as Conclusions fully warranted by preceding Proofs,

Proofs, is not only evident, from barely looking into them, but it is likewise certain, that they were known to this Gentleman, to be made use of as such, at the time he was thus representing them: Yes, Sir, I will leave it to the most partial of your Readers, to judge in this Matter, whether you must not have been conscious, that they were made use of as Truths already establish'd upon Reasoning and Proof, in the very Instant that you permitted your self to exhibit them as bare positive Assertions: This is obvious, in regard to the second Proposition, from the very Words, as you yourself have cited them; for thus you begin the Quotation, '*That it had been shewn* in the Course of this ' Paper: ' The Words, as they stand in the Paper, are, ' It has been *proved* in the Course of ' this Paper: ' But, take either the one or the other, is not what follows after, plainly consider'd, not as an Assertion, but as a previously demonstrated Truth? And was it not your Duty, instead of injuriously representing your Adversary as dealing in arbitrary *ipse dixits*, in place of Reasoning and Argument, to have had recourse to those Proofs to which the Author appealed, and fairly to have laid open their Fallacy, or, compelled by the Force of his unexceptionable Reasoning, to have acquiesced in his Conclusions? But, alas! Sir, it must still fare much worse with your Character, as a Writer in this Controversy, when we come to look into the first Proposition: This you likewise pretend to give in the Author's own Words; and, in order to exhibit it in the most striking Light of an Assertion merely dogmatical, your Quotation is thus introduced: ' The principal Thing the Author of '*Truth against Craft* insisteth upon, is, That it is ' a Thing past all Doubt, that the Sense which he ' had put upon the Clause, is the *very Sense in*

B 2

' which

‘ *which the Clause was universally understood by the House of Commons in the Day of the Debate, p. 21, 22.*’ The Passage you had before you runs thus : ‘ And as it is now PUT past all Doubt, that the Sense which our Author in p. 18. finds so much Fault with the Writer of *the Remarks* for having put upon this Clause, and which he acknowledges, in this Place, to be a *bad* Sense, and, in a former Passage, to be destructive of the fundamental Rights of this Country, was the very Sense in which the Clause was universally understood by the House of Commons in the Day of the Debate, there is not any Help for it, — but that our Author — must acknowledge, that *the Gentlemen who were in Opposition to the Court, certainly ought to be distinguish’d, as eminent Patriots, &c.*’

Thus, Sir, a Passage which clearly lay under your own Eye, as an unexceptionable Assumption of what the Writer apprehended had already been fully proved by him, you have thought yourself at Liberty to exhibit to the Public, as an arbitrary Position, which the Author wanted to be admitted without any Proof, on his own bare Assertion. If any Reason can be given why the two Words, ‘ Now, PUT,’ which so remarkably determine the Sense, were purposely omitted by you, consistently with Righteousness and Truth having at that time the Controul of your Mind, however *angry*, or *peevish*, or *deficient in Candour*, you may take me to be, I shall most sincerely rejoice. Should any Reader want to look into the Nature of the Proofs which the Author had adduced previous to his above Assumptions, he is requested to cast his Eye over the 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20th Pages of *Truth against Craft*. — But Instances worse than all these remain still to be mentioned,

You

You peremptorily assert, That the two Propositions, in the Light you had placed them, *are the principal Things which the Author has offer'd, to shew that the Clause was intended to subvert our fundamental Liberties.* Now, Sir, please to read over the following Paragraph, p. 17. of *Truth against Craft*, and then it shall be left to yourself to pronounce whether you did not know at the time you were uttering this peremptory Assertion, that the two Propositions, in the Light you had placed them, *were NOT the principal Things which the Author has offer'd, upon this Head.* His Words are these :

‘ That this was really the Case ; and that the
 ‘ Doctrine acknowledged in such strong Terms
 ‘ by our Author to be destructive of the essential
 ‘ Rights of this Kingdom, was the *real Doctrine*
 ‘ intended, in virtue of the Clause, to be made
 ‘ the establish’d Doctrine for the future, in regard
 ‘ to all public Money redundant in our Treasury,
 ‘ no body can have any Doubt, who either was
 ‘ present at the Argument, *or has read the AUTHENTIC Comment* contained in the *Considerations*, where it is avowed, and laid down by the
 ‘ Author, in almost every Page of that Book ;
 ‘ at present there needs only to mention a very
 ‘ short, but peremptory Passage in the 35th Page :
 ‘ “ *If such Trust be in the Crown, the King’s Consent is*
 ‘ “ *necessary* PREVIOUS to PUBLIC DELIBERATIONS,
 ‘ “ *on the Application.*” All Deliberations of the
 ‘ House of Commons, where there are two or
 ‘ three hundred Men, must, in their Nature, be
 ‘ public : So that here we are plainly given to
 ‘ understand, that though there should ever so
 ‘ large a Sum of the People’s or public Money,
 ‘ be got into the Treasury, yet the natural
 ‘ Guardians of the Properties and Liberties of
 ‘ the

‘ the People are not to be at Liberty, to take the
 ‘ least Thought about it. It may remain there
 ‘ for ever, without the Nation, whose Money it
 ‘ still is, being any thing the better for it : And
 ‘ if they are nothing the better, they will quickly
 ‘ be sensible, that they are vastly the worse : And
 ‘ it may be otherwise disposed of, without the
 ‘ Guardians of the Property of the Nation being
 ‘ any thing the wiser, unless the Crown, from its
 ‘ own mere good Pleasure, shall condescend, of
 ‘ its own Accord, *to tender the Accounts* ; see p. 41.
 ‘ of *the Considerations*. All this Doctrine, we see,
 ‘ can be confidently laid down, and the Author,
 ‘ the next Moment, with equal Confidence, af-
 ‘ firm, that no *new Power* is thereby added to the
 ‘ Crown ; but all is in Affirmance only of the
 ‘ King’s ancient Right ! Matchless Effrontery !

That the Proof here produced out of the
 Mouth of the Writer of *the Considerations*, is not
 merely a *principal* Article, but amounts to a
 direct Demonstration of all that was wanted to be
 proved under this Head, no Body can possibly
 dispute, who will acknowledge, that the Author
 of *the Considerations* was an *authentic* Evidence in
 this Matter, and that his Book was propagated
 by the Folks of Authority, and distributed *gratis*,
 for his Majesty’s Service.

It remains therefore on you to give some Ac-
 count, why a Passage, as full of Evidence as it
 could hold, was voluntarily with-held from the
 Eye of the Reader, while it was lying directly
 under your own ; and why, instead of attempting
 to shew the least Fallacy in the Proof, you *sup-*
pressed it altogether, and, in Place of it, chose
 rather to follow the Example of the Defender of
 the *Considerations*, hardily to assert, that, ‘ *I had*
 ‘ *really*

‘ really left the main Argument of the Pamphlet,
 ‘ which I undertook to refute, unanswered.’

I appeal to your own Friends, whether, till once some Means can be found out of reconciling such unfair Dealing as you have been guilty of, not only in this, but a Multitude of other Instances, with those solemn Professions you make of Integrity, it would not have been wiser to let alone your lamentable, and, in every one material Circumstance, your ill-grounded Complaints of injurious Usage, so formidably arranged towards the Conclusion of your Defence. After your having chosen to pass through the same dirty Road with the Writer of the *Considerations*, was it in Nature you could expect to come off, without, in some Degree, partaking of the same Kind of Stains.

Having, by this Time, as it is imagined, pretty clearly demonstrated, that your peremptory Assertion of your principal Argument having been left unanswered, is an Assertion contrary to Eye-sight, it may be proper to proceed to make some few Observations on several distinct Passages in the Course of your Defence. In p. 14. you have this Paragraph; ‘ The Author of *the Case* might therefore, according to the Light in which Things appeared to him, in the highest Consistency with his being an honest Man, and zealous for the Liberties of his Country, appear so far in Defence of the Clause, as to endeavour to shew, that if it had passed, it would not have been subversive of those Liberties, and that it was wrong to raise such a Clamour against it, as if it tended to bring irretrievable Ruin upon us.’ Then you instantly subjoin, ‘ and this will shew how little this Writer’s Syllogism, p. 32, and 33, though dress’d out with so much Pomp of Mood and Figure, is to the Purpose.’ And now, Sir,

Sir, it rests upon you to make it appear, how the former Part of this Paragraph, were every Word of it unexceptionably true, can, in any possible Sense, be conducive to shew, that the Syllogism referred to was not to the Purpose. The Intention of the Syllogism was to demonstrate (for all direct and legitimate Syllogisms are strict Demonstrations) that upon the Principles which you had distinctly avowed in the Course of your Book, you had laid yourself under a Necessity of acknowledging, that the Commons of *Ireland*, the last Session of Parliament, did no more than what they had a Right to do, and than their Duty laid them under an indispensable Obligation of doing, in regard to the Bill for discharging the national Debt: Previous to this Syllogism it had been proved, at great Length, that the Sense in which the Commons of *Ireland*, on both Sides, understood the Clause, was totally different from the Sense in which you appeared to understand it, and that it was their Sense and not yours, that was alone material in the Cause: It was likewise proved, that if you once came to understand it in the same Sense with them, and kept true to yourself, and to the Character of an honest Man, which were confessedly at that Time still within your Power, you must immediately range yourself on the same Side with those who rejected the Bill: But though this should never come to be the Case, yet you must still necessarily acknowledge, according to the Principles laid down in your Book, that so far as the House of Commons understood the Clause in the Sense so totally different from yours, so far they were under a Necessity of rejecting the Bill; and that the Writers, who justified the rejecting it, justified it solely on the Principles which you avowed to be your own. How then is it possible, that any thing you have alledged in this Paragraph, could,
in

in any Sense upon Earth, be apprehended, even by you, to shew that the Syllogism, which had been thus formally dressed up, with the professed Design, that you might, with the greater Precision, make your Reply, was nothing to the Purpose? it may be worth your while seriously to reflect, whether such a Manner of speaking and acting can be made to appear, to the Public, consistent with Sincerity as your Principle, and Justice and Truth as the Objects of your Search? Seeing you would needs reply, was there any thing, in Nature, and to any honest Purpose, left for you to have done, than either to prove, that the Sense of the House of Commons was the same with your own, or that though it was not, yet *your Sense* ought to have been understood by them as the real Subject of the Controversy in Contra-distinction to theirs; or lastly, that the Premisses asserted in the Syllogism either were not true, or would not justify the Conclusion that was drawn from them, namely, that you were of the same Principles with the Patriots who rejected the Bill: Not one of these have you so much as attempted; but appealing, from Reason and fair Argument, to quite another Court, you would have the World to conclude you still in the Right, merely upon your asserting *your Conscientiousness to your own Integrity*.

In p. 14, 15, instead of making any proper Reply to the Observation I had made in general in p. 9, 10, that it must be a wicked Attempt to go about to persuade the Public that the Actions of the Ministry are imputable to the Person of the Prince, to which was subjoined an useful Instruction, that all that is good, in Regard to the Administration of *Great Britain*, &c. is to be imputed to the Prince, and all that is bad to be charged, as far as the Nature of the Thing will possibly

C

permit,

permit, solely on his Ministry : Indignant, that you should be thought to stand in need of any Instruction of this Sort, you assert that you were well acquainted with all this Matter before ; and affirm, that I take it in that Place for granted, that the sending over the Clause was a very destructive Measure, &c. *and no better than a barefaced and shameless begging of the very Question in Debate*, Words which I had used and proved in *Truth against Craft* ; but can they now be proved ? The very reverse is the Fact ; so far from begging any Question, I had taken nothing for granted but a Matter of notorious Truth, which you yourself had acknowledged in the most explicit Terms, namely, that the People actually believed that their fundamental Liberties were in Danger, and that the Commons, who rejected the Clause, regarded it, as having an ill Aspect on our Liberties, &c.

And now, Sir, please to pronounce, whether knowing, as you did, that this was the general State of Mind of his Majesty's most zealously well affected Protestant Subjects of this Kingdom, it was not a monstrous Attempt in you, contrary to what you knew to be the universal Perswasion of this Country, to set yourself, with such determined and zealous Purpose, to make all these good Subjects believe, that what they understood to be a very bad Clause, and which, in its Consequences, would prove a most destructive Measure to this Country, was a Measure of his Majesty's own, and that it was neither true nor fair to impute it solely to his Ministry. Say, likewise, Sir, whether there is the least Semblance of begging any Question, in this Kind of Reasoning ? and whether, according to your Manner of proceeding, the Instances of *Glencoe* and *Wood's Patent* might not, with Parity of Reason, have been brought home to the Person of King *William* and of King *George*

George the first? Had you been writing indeed to a Parcel of Slaves, it might have been Matter of Humanity to have seasonably thrown out such a significant Caution: ‘ Unhappy Men, dare not
 ‘ to complain of any Measure of the Ministry,
 ‘ while they continue in Power, for not a Measure of theirs, or of any who act under them,
 ‘ but what may be easily proved, by political
 ‘ Advocates, to be the sacred Measure of his
 ‘ Majesty in Person.’

In p. 16. of your Defence you have this remarkable Paragraph.

‘ One of the heaviest Charges advanced against
 ‘ the Author of the *Case stated*, and which, according to our Author’s Manner, is most tragically
 ‘ exaggerated, relates to his misrepresenting the
 ‘ Author of the Remarks, and the honourable
 ‘ Gentleman who writ the Proceedings of the
 ‘ House of Commons vindicated, as if they
 ‘ maintained, not only that the House of Commons had a Right, but the sole Right of applying the unappropriated Surplus in the Treasury.
 ‘ But any one that impartially reads that Part of
 ‘ the Case, must be sensible that the Intention
 ‘ of the Author was not to charge those Gentlemen, as having really and intentionally maintained that the Commons had the sole Right of applying the unappropriated Money; as if this
 ‘ was their Principle. He only observed that the
 ‘ Argument they used, if it were to the Purpose, looked that Way. It is an allowed Maxim,
 ‘ that an Argument which proves too much
 ‘ proves nothing at all. The Intention was to
 ‘ shew that their Argument proved too much,
 ‘ as they managed it. But he did not intend to
 ‘ charge it upon them as their real Opinion that
 ‘ the Commons had the sole Right. And indeed

‘ this Supposition would have spoiled the Force
 ‘ of the Observrtion he had made, that Their
 ‘ Argument proved more than themselves intended. I know no Reason therefore why this
 ‘ Writer should cry out upon it as a foul Insinuation, &c.’

In order to shew into what miserable Shifts the Mind must suffer itself to be driven, when once it has determined, in any Instance, not to submit to the Dominion of Truth and Evidence of Facts, it may be proper to set down from the *Case fairly stated* the original Passage concerning this Article, p. 35. ‘ But here it may be observed, that these
 ‘ ingenious Writers seem to have carried it farther than they themselves intended. If the
 ‘ Precedents here produced by them were to the
 ‘ Purpose, they would prove, that the Commons
 ‘ have not only a Right, but *the sole* Right, not
 ‘ not only of raising the Money, and of appropriating Part of it, when they raise it, to special
 ‘ Uses, but of applying the unappropriated Surplus remaining in the Treasury. For they
 ‘ represent it as the constant Usage for the Commons themselves to apply the several Surplusses,
 ‘ which would be to leave his Majesty no distinct Power of Application at all; and this is
 ‘ what these Gentlemen would not be thought to pretend, and would indeed be inconsistent with
 ‘ the *present* Constitution of this Kingdom.

Reader, when you have Leisure, be pleased to compare this with a Passage in p. 30. of the same Pamphlet, in which it is plainly insinuated, that there are some Persons, who, from their Zeal for Liberty, would be for altering the Constitution in such Manner, as to change it from a *Monarchy* to an *Aristocracy*; and therefore it is, that he, as a Lover of his Country, thinks himself obliged
 to

to oppose whatsoever tendeth to make a material Alteration in it : In the mean time, let us look a little into the Nature of this notable Passage just now cited from *the Defence*.

You begin, Sir, with observing, that the Charge here under Consideration, was one of the heaviest that had been advanced against the Author of *the Case* : Heavy enough it must be owned of all Conscience ; yet it is much to be feared, that, by the Means you have taken in order to get rid of it, you have been only most unhappily increasing the Weight : Instead of pleading, that your Zeal had betrayed you into the Use of some Expressions without properly attending to their Signification ; and instead of candidly acknowledging, that the Assertion you had there used, did indeed convey a Sense equally groundless and injurious in regard to the Gentlemen ; and therefore, in order, as far as possible, to make them Reparation, you thought it your Duty to confess, upon this Occasion, your Over-sight and Error. Instead of this simple, and only candid Apology, you have chosen to tell the Public, *that you know no Reason why this Writer*, meaning the Author of *Truth*, &c. *should cry out upon it as a foul Insinuation, or interpret it as an unworthy Reflexion cast upon these Gentlemen, &c.*

To give this a Colour, you insist, *that any one that impartially reads that Part of the Case, must be sensible, that the Intention of the Author was not to charge those Gentlemen, as having really and intentionally maintained that the Commons had the sole Right of applying the unappropriated Money ;* mark well the Words, “ that the Commons had THE “ SOLE RIGHT.” This Phrase, it is true, did not enter into your Charge, nor is it easy to see for what candid Purpose it is here introduced ? Your
real

real Charge stood thus, ‘ *For they,*’ that is the two Writers, ‘ REPRESENT it as the constant Usage of the Commons THEMSELVES to apply the several ‘ *Surplusses.*’ Are not these, Sir, your own express Words? Was not the Fact false? Is not the Charge highly injurious in respect to those two Writers? And when all this was directly exhibited to your Eye-sight, had you then any thing else left to do, but, as far as in your Power, to set about to repair the Injury you had done, by openly retracting this Charge? especially, as there is the strongest Presumption, that, at the Time of writing these Words, it must have been your Purpose actually to charge these Writers with this Representation; for to what other possible End could they here be inserted, seeing it is obvious, that the only natural Way of expressing the Sense, which you now profess to have intended, was by leaving them out?

You farther alledge, in the Defence, ‘ *That you only observed, that the Argument these Gentlemen used, if it were to the Purpose, looked that Way,*’ namely, as if these Gentlemen had intentionally maintained that the Commons had the sole Right, and then you go on to assert, ‘ *That your Intention was to shew, that their Argument proved too much, as they managed it.*’ Now, Sir, let the World judge, whether, if you had been wanting to exhibit an Example of what is to be understood by, ‘ *Craft in Controversy,*’ a stronger Instance could well have been given than what is now here before us.

The Author of *Truth against Craft* had called upon you to shew, ‘ how the bare quoting of ‘ *Precedents,*’ for to Precedents alone did the Passage relate, ‘ could possibly prove any thing ‘ more than merely the real Nature and Circum-
stances

‘stances of the Facts of which they were the ‘Records?’ Unable to return any Answer, but what must have exposed the Absurdity, as well as Injustice, of what you had been asserting, at the same Time unwilling that it should ever be thought that any thing you had once undertaken to maintain, could afterwards prove too hard for your polemical Skill; ‘by dextrous Slight of Hand, you instantly withdraw the definite Word, ‘Precedents,’ of a fixed Signification, from the Eye of your Reader, and substitute, with equal Dexterity, the indefinite Word, ‘Argument,’ of vague and various Application, into its Place. And thus having effected a Change of the Terms, you flatter yourself that you had found out a Way of getting clear of the Difficulty; and immediately you allow yourself peremptorily to assert, *That your Intention was to shew, that their ARGUMENT proved too much, as they managed it.* I heartily wish it were more easy to conceive how this could, at that Time, have possibly been your Intention; most certain it is, that there is not the least Semblance of an Argument, whether proving too much or too little, much less any Trace of *managing* an Argument, to be found in the Passage, from whence this very material Article was to have been shewn. On the contrary, it had actually been shewn, that, both by express Words, and from the general Turn and Conclusion of the Passage, you had most grossly misrepresented the Authors against whom you were writing; it had also been shewn, that by asserting that the Precedents would prove that the Commons had the sole Right, you had likewise grossly offended against Fact and against Sense.

These Articles, so odious in their Nature, had been shewn and demonstrated in so clear and
full

full a Light, that your old Acquaintance thought it no improper Intimation, that such Conduct would require an explicit Repentance : The very Reverse of this is the Part you have chosen ; by practising the Art of juggling with Words, and hazarding the Belief of some bold Assertions, on the Authority of your Character, you have set yourself to persuade your Readers, even contrary to Eye-sight, that there was never any Foundation for either of these Articles ; and that all that had been done to give Occasion to the Outcry, in *Truth against Craft*, amounted to no more than the harmless *Supposition of the two Gentlemen having been mistaken in their Reasoning, by making Use of an Argument which proved too much !* Whether the Measure which I had intimated, or the one which you have chosen, was the better fitted to do Honour to your Character, as well as to Truth, must now be left to the Public to determine ; but seeing you had determined to trust all to the Weight of your Authority and Credit with your Readers, and to the Dexterity of your Art, I cannot help expressing myself in the same Manner, and still with more Earnestness, than I did on this same Subject before. — Seeing this was your Purpose, would to God you had let alone those solemn Appeals, which are repeatedly to be found towards the Conclusion of *your Defence*.

To what End you persist in your preposterous Contention concerning the Case of Sir *Henry Tichburne*, it is not easy to guess, unless having once pronounced, ‘ That it was not to the Purpose,’ you are apprehensive, that your Credit with the Public would be in danger of suffering, if you did not appear to them, whether Reason will or not, still of the same Mind : What you had offer’d on this Subject, in your *Case fairly stated*, appear’d to me to consist of such pettyfogging Conceits,

Conceits, none of them the natural Growth of your own Understanding, that, instead of a minute Refutation, I thought myself sure that one or two obvious Questions would abundantly suffice to expose their Absurdity, as well to yourself, as to every other reasonable Person.

The principal Notion on which the whole seem'd to be rested, was taken from hence, That, as in a former Act of Parliament King *Charles* had been restrained from charging this new Fund of the *Hearth-Money*, which he had got in the Place of the *Wards and Liveries*, with *Gifts, Grants, or Pensions*, therefore there was a Necessity for the *House of Commons* to become the first Movers, in order to the King's being enabled to discharge a Debt of Justice and Honour to Sir *Henry Tichburn*, which, you take it for granted, the King was disqualified by the above Act from paying, without being enabled by another Act to discharge it out of this Fund.

Effectually to cure you of this groundless Conceit, I conceived that nothing more could be requisite than barely to put you on resolving a Question or two, to the following Purpose, to the Satisfaction of your own Mind :

Whether it was not an Imagination too gross for Sense, to conceive, that King *Charles the Second* was in reality solicitous to discharge a Debt to Sir *Henry Tichburn* of two thousand Pounds Value, but had no other Way of doing it, but by obtaining Leave from his *Parliament of Ireland* to make a Payment of this Sum out of the *Hearth-Money*?

2dly, How it was possible to enter into any Man's Head, That, because the Crown was re-
D
strain'd

strain'd from loading this Fund with *Gifts*, *Grants*, or *Pensions*, so as to lessen the Income in the Hands of the *Successors*, therefore, after the King had actually got the annual Produce of it into his Pocket, he still remained under an equal Restraint of giving a single Shilling of it away, according to his own Inclination, without an Act of Parliament ?

In respect to every thing material in the former of these Questions, you have thought fit, in *your Defence*, to be totally silent : So that it must now be taken for granted, that you do in reality believe King *Charles the Second* had it honestly at Heart to give Sir *Henry Tichburn* this Money, but had no way of getting it done, but by his *Irisb Parliament* setting him at Liberty to apply two thousand Pounds for this Purpose, out of this only Fund, the annual Income of which had been granted to him without any Appropriation, and which he had been in the actual Receipt of, to the Value of thirty or forty thousand Pounds a Year, for three Years before :

The Supposition, indeed, that King *Charles the Second* would rather have *avoided* making this Payment, you could not but be aware, must ruin your whole Cause ; for then we should have had an Instance, not only of the *House of Commons* being the first Movers in regard to the Application of Money formerly granted to the Crown, but becoming the Movers, notwithstanding they had Grounds to believe, that such an Application would be so far unacceptable to his Majesty, that, were he to have been left to his own Inclinations, it would never have been made.

In respect to the second Question, you indeed set it down ; but you seem to have thought, that
barely

barely setting it down was sufficient to answer it : For thus you remark ; ‘ So that all the Limitation, the Author of *Truth*, &c. makes the King to be under, with regard to the Money arising from the *Hearths*, is, that he was not to give any thing out of it, before he got it ; but after he had once got it into his Coffers, he might dispose of it to what Uses he thought proper.’ Now, notwithstanding your appearing to mention this Distinction, as a Matter of Ridicule, yet I have no Difficulty of acknowledging, that, with a little Variation, such was my Sense ; and I thought it must likewise be the Sense of every reasonable-Man.

Doubtless, it was absolutely necessary to restrain King *Charles the Second* from granting *Pensions*, &c. so as to lessen this Fund, intended for a permanent Fund for the Support of the Crown, in the Hands of his Successors ; and likewise highly expedient, as far as it was practicable, to prevent his rendering himself necessitous, by *Grants* in *future*, or by mortgaging it for Life : But, to allege, that after he had got perhaps fifty or more thousand Pounds of the Produce of this Fund into his Pocket, that tho’ he were ever so willing, still he remained incapacitated to pay a just Debt, or even to make a Donation to a faithful and suffering Servant to the Value of two thousand, without the Authority of an *Act of Parliament*, carries, so full in the Face of it, an Appearance of Absurdity, that it requires an Authority somewhat better than yours before it can be received to be Law : If the Act of Parliament had, indeed, said expressly what you have asserted, “ *it says expressly, that no Sum or Sums of Money, arising out of this Fund, shall be given or granted by the King,*” tho’, even then, it could not have born your Construction, yet would it certainly be difficult to say what Construction it could bear : For,

D 2

surely,

surely, no body can possibly imagine it could ever be intended, that the King should make no Use of the Money at all : But the Act of Parliament doth not contain, as far as I can perceive, any such Words.

Seeing, however, that Topics of the above sort have made no Impression, please now to consider, how little it would be to your Purpose, tho' all you have been contending for should, for Argument sake, be implicitly given up to you : If the Doctrine of the Necessity of the *Crown's previous Consent* had, at that time, been consider'd as a Doctrine essential to his Majesty's *Prerogative*, and it was only to shew that no such Doctrine then obtained that the *Precedent* was produced, how doth it alter the Case, tho' an Act of Parliament for enlarging the King's Power in a particular Instance, should be granted to be ever so requisite ? This, indeed, on Supposition that the King was wanting such an Enlargement of Power, might be a very good Reason for his Majesty's desiring his Commons to bring in such a Bill ; and, surely, desiring would have been a very significant Manner of notifying, that he would Consent : But how could the House of Commons pretend in this Case more than in any other, to violate or invade this establish'd *Prerogative* of his Majesty, by bringing in a Bill without any *Leave*, or *previous Notification* whatsoever, concerning his Royal Consent ?

This Matter will still be much stronger on the other Supposition, which was evidently the Truth, that the King had no great Inclination to do Justice to the Knight, either out of this or of any other Fund.

In this Case, could any thing else have been reasonably expected, but that, instead of complying,

ing, his Majesty would have laid hold of such an Opportunity to express his Displeasure against all such officious and invasive Measures of his Commons, in daring to point out to him, in so direct Violation of his *Royal Prerogative*, this or any Application of Money formerly granted to him, and to his Successors, in Terms so unlimited, without his *previous Leave* having been first given or obtained?

By this time, Sir, I hope it must be clear, even to yourself, that, upon every Supposition which you can possibly form, Whether the King was under a Disability of paying Sir *Henry Tichburn* any Money, without Leave from his Parliament, or not; Whether he was wanting to be enabled to do Justice to this Gentleman, or not; still the Prerogative of the King, and the Rights of the Commons, in regard to Money formerly granted to the Crown, must necessarily have continued in the same State as before: It being then undeniable, that the *House of Commons of Ireland*, in the Reign of King *Charles the Second*, did, in the Instance of Sir *Henry Tichburn*, claim and exercise a Power, in Virtue of a Right inherent in themselves, of pointing out to his Majesty an Application of unappropriated Money formerly granted to the Crown in perpetuity, without waiting for *Leave*, or any *previous Notification of Consent*; and that an Act of Parliament had passed, appointing this Application, in Consequence of this Exertion of their Right: Seeing all this must of Necessity be acknowledged to be true, is it not reasonable to expect of you, that, instead of your persisting any longer dogmatically to assert, *That this Instance was nothing to the Purpose*, and, in Spite of every Quibble that may have since been suggested to you for Support of that Assertion, you will now honestly and openly pronounce,

nounce, that this *Precedent*, standing on the unchangeable Basis of Justice and Sense, is not only a most direct and irresistible Proof of the whole of the Purpose for which it was adduced, but that it likewise makes it manifest, that, in the Days of *Charles the Second*, it was consider'd as a Doctrine which could admit of no Dispute, That nothing could preclude a Parliament from offering Advice to the Crown, in regard to the Application of Money granted by themselves, in however general Terms, for the Support of the Crown, and the Uses of Government.

In p. 19. and 20. you are pleased to let out your Mind in such Declarations as seem to me to contain something still more extraordinary than all that we have hitherto met with : Your external Denomination, which you had chosen for yourself, as a *fair Stater of the Case*, and much more your internal Principle and Character of a *fair and impartial Man*, ought, in all Reason, to have determined you invariably to follow Truth, whithersoever it might lead you ; not to suffer your Judgment to be warped by any Inclination whatsoever, but solely to be determined by the native Force and Authority of Evidence ; yet we have you here, in very plain Words, confessing, that you had set your Affection upon a certain Conclusion, without any respect to the intrinsic Merits, and real Truth, of the Case. Speaking of the Gentlemen who, in Consequence of Misrepresentation to his Majesty, had been dismissed from his Service, of whose Abilities and Loyalty you tell us that you had a good Opinion, and whose Removal, therefore, gave you *some Concern*, you have these express Words : ‘ That you had much rather it should
 ‘ be thought, that they had carried their Opposi-
 ‘ tion, in some Instances, too far, than that, under
 ‘ his Majesty’s Government, an Invasion should
 ‘ be

‘ be made, upon our essential Liberties !’ —
 Not many Years ago, there was a remarkable Trial before the Council of *England*, on Occasion of a Complaint which was brought by some of the Inhabitants of *Minorca*, alledging, that they had suffer’d most grievous Oppression from the tyrannical Domination of a certain Deputy, under his Majesty’s Government : According to our Author, the Lords of the Council, who were to hear and to determine upon the Merits of this Complaint, should have carried this Prepossession, or practical Principle, into the Seat of Judgment along with them, That it was much more suitable, and more to be wished, that Men, however innocent, should be thought to be guilty, than that ever it should be said, that, under his Majesty’s Government, any Outrage had been committed, by any Deputy of his Majesty, tho’ the Fact were ever so true, and the personal Spirit and Conduct of the Deputy ever so near a-kin to those of *Strafford* or *Tyrconnel*, or even of still some more flagitious Minister, if possible, than they.

Will any Man say, that Righteousness and Truth could have the governing Direction of any Person’s Mind, who was thus unguardedly pouring out such Sentiments as these from the Fulness of his Heart ?

Monstrous ! that it should ever come to this in the Breast of any Man, who ever understood that fundamental Doctrine of the original Equality, in point of natural Rights, between Man and Man, or even ever felt the Power of Nature’s great Distinction between Right and Wrong, that rather than a Governor from *England*, or the Favourites who acted under him, though acting ever so injuriously, should be exposed, would much sooner chuse that the best Servants
 of

of the Crown, and the worthiest Friends of their Country, should not only suffer, but be deemed *justly to suffer* all such Oppression!

Nay, admitting the Supposition, that a Partiality may be pardonable, in the Name of Humanity, who could you think were the properest Objects of the Favour of this Country? The Man who was thought capable of writing, in Style truly eastern, the remarkable Letter referred to in *Truth against Craft*, together with the Men who complied to his Terms, or those free-born Spirits who set at nought all his Threatnings when they thought their Rights were invaded?

Is it in Nature, that you, Sir, can be in Truth more solicitous for the Honour of the Men, who, by spreading false Reports, and by sundry other Arts the latter End of the former Session, and by the meanest Adulation the Beginning of the last, had first found Means to bring our Linen Manufacture into an Extremity of Danger, and next contended strenuously for a Measure in regard to it, which must necessarily have exposed it to infinite Hazards, particularly to the visible Hazard of reducing all our Laws concerning it into a State of precarious Subsistence from Session to Session; is it possible that such Men as these can, in reality, be more the Objects of your internal Affection, than those resolute Patriots, who, far above making their Court by adulatory Complaisance, at the Expence of bringing their Country into imminent and unnecessary Danger, were inflexibly determined, as far as in them lay, to place this its principal Source of our Support out of Hazard for the future from all clandestine Arts; and likewise, from ever becoming an Engine

gine for bringing into Danger the general Rights of this Kingdom? But to go on,

In the same Place, we have another Declaration, in a Spirit not a little a-kin to the last. Hitherto, to 'think no Evil of our Neighbour, till we are forced to it, as well as never to rejoice in Iniquity, but to rejoice always in the Truth,' have been consider'd as Duties of moral and indispensable Obligation; but are here treated as Matters of mere arbitrary Affection, and courteous Complaisance. Having declared, in *the Case fairly stated*, That you doubted not many of those who voted against the Clause, were actuated by an honest Regard to the Interest of their Country, you now tell us, That you do not retract that Acknowledgment: But you cannot carry your Complaisance so far as to believe the same of the whole; now, Sir, you ought to have known that Diversity of Character, with respect to that invariable Integrity and Righteousness, with which the whole of Life ought to be conducted, does not, in Cases of this Sort, make any Difference: Seeing, therefore, it is confessed by you, that *many of that Body acted upon honest Principles*, it is plain, that the Nature of the Thing did not hinder but that the whole might have done so; and, therefore, this ought, in Justice, to have been taken for granted, unless from your own private Knowledge, in regard to some of the Individuals, you had Reason to know, that the contrary had been the Fact; in which Case, seeing these Individuals could not be mentioned, the whole of the Declaration ought to have been let alone. But all Insinuations of this Sort, as they are unfair in their Nature, so, in regard to their Effects, they must, for the future, be utterly in vain: Nothing can now hinder, but that the House of Commons, who, by rejecting the Clause, so criti-

E

cally

cally vindicated their own Right, and likewise an essential Right of this Kingdom, this last Session of Parliament, must be held in Remembrance by the present Generation, and conveyed down from Age to Age to the latest Posterity, under that most honourable Appellation of THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOUR PATRIOTS, WHO DELIVERED THEIR COUNTRY ON THE SEVENTEENTH OF DECEMBER, ONE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THREE.

Many other Passages there are in this Defence which most justly deserve severe Reprehension ; indeed, there is hardly one Paragraph which does not appear, to your old Acquaintance, to have been written in a very unhappy mood ; but enough has already been said to answer my Purpose in regard to the Public. I must not, however, omit to take some little Notice of an Accusation or two, which you have brought against myself, together with that black List of Scandal, as you want it to be understood, which you have muster'd up out of *Truth against Craft*, at the Conclusion of your Book : Your illustrating your own Modesty, by placing it in Contrast with the Impudence of your Antagonist, and even charging me with assuming the infallible Chair, merely because I expressed myself in a manner that was natural to any Person, who was conscious of having acquainted himself with the Truth and Nature of the Facts before he ventured to assert, and to enter into Reasoning about them, served only to divert me : Nay, even your charging me, in express Terms, *with taking the Prerogative of the Almighty out of his Hands*, merely for pretending so far to judge in common with yourself, and with all the World besides, concerning the Qualities of the Heart, as to pronounce, from their respective Fruits, betwixt Truth and Simplicity

plicity of Spirit on the one Hand, and Falshood and Double-mindedness on the other, even this awful Accusation had no other Effect, than, from seeing how totally you had suffered your Resentment to extinguish your Reason, to excite my Pity. But when you come to charge me with *attacking* and *asperging* your moral Character, the Matter is not quite so personal. If it could once be made appear that I had, in reality, been guilty of asperging your Character, it would then unavoidably follow, not merely that I was in the Wrong, but that you must, in every such Instance, have been in the Right.

It was my avowed Intention, to make it evident to the Public, that the Cause you had engaged in was so very bad, that even you, Sir, had been obliged to have recourse to the unmanly and dishonest Arts of Sophistry and Deceit in order to support it. And seeing there is not one single Sentence bearing hard on your Character, in *Truth against Craft*, but what is intirely confined and solely relates to the Spirit you had shewn in *the Case fairly stated*, without the least Appearance of reference to your general Conduct, or to one prior Action in the whole Course of your Life, it must thence naturally follow, that so far as any of the Reflexions contained in my Pamphlet can be made out to be, in reality, groundless Aspersions, incapable of being supported with any proper Evidence out of your *Case fairly stated*, so far you stand acquitted of the general Charge, and I must have been guilty of bringing against you Accusations that were false, or *real Aspersions*. In this Light therefore it must be acknowledged, that the Charge of asperging your Character would be truly material, in Respect to the Argument, could it once be fairly made out; but surely, Sir, upon such an Occasion it

was too much, even for you, to expect that merely the Solemnity of your Appeals, when utterly unaccompanied with any Kind of Proof, should cause it to be taken for granted, that every Reflexion bearing hard on your Character must, of Course, be an *Asperſion* injurious and false.

You are not ſo ignorant in Matters of this Sort, as not to have known, that to aſperſe a Man's Character, is either to bring ſome odious Impu- tation againſt it which is malevolent and ground- leſs, or elſe, after having officiouſly made Search into a Man's private Life, then wantonly or in- vidiouſly to expoſe to the Public whatever ſecret Folly the Inquiſitor happened to detect, though it could answer no valuable Purpoſe to have it made known.

In reſpect to the Firſt, it now muſt be left to the Judgment of the Reader, whether the Pam- phlet of *Truth againſt Craft*, inſtead of bringing arbitrary Accuſations without any Proof, hath not proved to a Demonſtration, that the Arts of Sophiſtry and Deceit had, in reality, been re- peatedly practiſed in the *Caſe fairly ſtated*, and that upon them chiefly reſted the Merits of your Cauſe? and to the ſame Judgment it is left, whether it has not been made evident, even to Eye-ſight, in the preceding Part of this preſent Letter, that the ſame Arts have been repeated with Circumſtances of high Aggravation in *your Defence*? in this Senſe then it is plain there may be Accuſations and yet no Aſperſions.

And in Reſpect to the other, I appeal even to yourſelf, whether there is the leaſt Trace or Appearance of any ſuch Petulancy throughout that Pamphlet? — Yes, Sir, I appeal to yourſelf, notwithstanding that remarkable Paſſage towards
the

the Conclusion of your Defence, wherein the contrary is insinuated in Terms so pointed, as could not but lead every unsuspecting Reader immediately to conclude, that I must have been actually making Inquiries into your past Life and Character, and those so far back as to your earliest Youth, in order to find out Materials against you for Scandal and Reproach; the Passage, indeed, is so singular, in more Respects than one, that I cannot avoid inserting it just as it came from your Pen.

‘ They that intimately know the Person whom he has thought fit to asperse, will not think it too assuming in him to declare, that he is not afraid of the strictest Inquiry into his past Life and Character from his earliest Youth to this Day: His Temper and Conduct has been such, that he has nothing to apprehend from what either open Enemies, if he has any, or passionate Men who may call themselves his Friends, can, with Truth, say against him. All the Return he makes to this Gentleman for his Insinuations, is most sincerely to wish him a greater Degree of Candour, and a more equal Temper of Mind!’

I return you all the Thanks which your good Wishes deserve; but it would have given me a much better Idea of your own Temper of Mind, if, instead of them, you had set yourself distinctly to point out, wherein I had betrayed a Deficiency in Candour, and to have assigned some significant Instance where my Temper had led me to do you any Wrong. Whether your principal Design in writing this Paragraph was to do Honour to yourself, or to bring Disgrace upon me, it may not be easy to determine, nor is the Inquiry material; it is sufficient to remark, that, at the Time of your writing it, you perfectly well
knew

knew that the the Author of *Truth against Craft* had never insinuated any, not even the slightest Article to your Disadvantage, but what solely had their Reference to your *Case fairly stated*, and these were not properly Insinuations, they were expressly spoken out.

It was, as I have just now mentioned, my avowed Intention, in *Truth against Craft*, to make it evident to the Public, that the Cause you had embarked in was so thoroughly rotten, that nothing but *Falshood and Sophistry and Doctrines, manifestly subversive of all Liberty, could, even by such able Advocates as you and the Author of the Considerations, be urged in Support of it.* See *Truth, &c. p. 7.* And if you could have shewn, which was the *unum Necessarium*, in your Defence, that I had failed in my Proof, then, whether my Petulancy had been owing to my Self-sufficiency or Passion, to my Want of good Breeding or of Christian Charity, to my Peevishness or Deficiency of Candour, or even to my daring Impiety, in taking the Prerogative of the Almighty out of his Hands, whether to all or to any of these, the Matter was much the same, no Censure could be too severe; I had then nothing to do but have bowed down in Confusion, and laid my Mouth in the Dust: But if, on the contrary, Sophistry and Falshoods were in reality the Arts to which you and the Author of the *Considerations* had actually your Resort, then, whether the detecting of those Arts, instead of being resolved into Passion and Prejudice, or into any other unworthy Motive or Spring of Action in the Mind, ought not in Justice to be ascribed to a real Sense of Duty and moral Obligation in respect to the true Merits of the Cause, and the true Interests of the Country, cannot be a Matter of difficult Decision; this is the Point remaining now to be settled, and will

will be readily determined by an honest Solution of the few following Questions.

Whether it is not more righteous in itself, and more profitable to the Community, that dishonest Arts should be detected, than that a most honest and interesting Cause should be silently given up, and the best Friends of the Community left to suffer the various Injuries of false Representation, in Consequence of the Practice of such dishonest Arts? And secondly,

Whether it was not one of the most effectual, and one of the most obvious, Methods of doing Justice to those Patriots, and to the Cause they supported, which an honest Writer could take, in the fairest and fullest Manner to lay open these Arts, and to bring them home to their Authors; in order thereby to prevent the unsuspecting Public from being any longer imposed on and misled, in Consequence of the Opinion they had formerly conceived of the Authority in point of Credit, as well as of the Abilities, of the Authors of these Arts; and whether the higher the Authority, the Obligation did not, in Proportion, become the more indispensable on the Writer, without Respect to Persons, to declare the whole Truth, as well as nothing but the Truth, in laying open these Arts?

Whether the Proneness, which I understand some honest Folks have shewn, to censure the Writer of *Truth against Craft*, as having been unjustifiably warm, and of having allowed himself to set down several Things in Anger, in composing that Pamphlet, be strictly consistent, I do not say with any favourable Indulgence, for, in Cases of this Sort, I readily own no Indulgence is due, but with a proper Respect to their usual
Candour

Candour and Justice, it may perhaps concern themselves, more than the Author, minutely to determine? Surely, if Displacence, or even the stronger Feeling of Indignation, so natural to the human Heart against Craft and Dishonesty, must needs be called Anger, it must at least be allowed to be of that Species of Anger that is quite free from Sin, and therefore, if I do not mistake, should, for that very Reason, stand quite free from Blame: But be this as it will, so far is certain, that as there was not a single Reflection to the Disadvantage of your Character which I did not stand justified to myself in making, at the Time I was setting it down, from a Sense of its being true, and conducive to the Purpose which I openly profess'd, so now that I have been called upon to take a careful Review of them, in the Collection you have thought fit to republish towards the Conclusion of your Defence, I readily declare, that they still continue to appear to me in the very same Light; nor do I know any one Accusation that has been brought against you, which, were the Proof again to be gone over, would not fully be justified from Evidence arising solely out of your Book, one single Article only excepted; this Article relates to the Charge of *evil Communications*, and I own there is not any thing in your *Case fairly stated* which will strictly bear me out in this Accusation; wherefore, if telling you the simple Truth of this Matter shall not be thought a sufficient Apology, I shall readily make you all the Reparation which Justice can require: In reality, it was not in my Power, at the Time I was writing, so much as to form a Belief that several offensive Articles which I met with in your Book, could possibly have been the spontaneous and uninfinituated Production of your own Understanding.

As for the rest, their Truth is so established, from numerous express Passages, as well as the general Spirit of your Book, that I can see no possible Remedy, but that they must get Leave to continue as they are; not, indeed, as they are set forth in your Collection; for there you have exhibited a new Cast of your Craft, by misquoting the Words, and perverting the Sense, but as they are to be found in their original Connection. Was there, in your Situation, any possible Remedy which Nature and Sense could suggest, but one of these three? Either to have set yourself to shew that the Charges were false or arbitrary, and had not been proved; or, finding that matter too strong, to have candidly acknowledged, that you had been mistaken; or, lastly, to have been silent: But what you could propose merely from a Republication of the Charges themselves, it is not easy to conceive.— Surely, it is too much for any Man, be he who he will, to expect that the Public should instantly pronounce a Fact not to be true, without any other Reason, but purely because it bears hard on his personal Character; the best Men are naturally the farthest removed from all such Expectations: Is it possible, for Instance, you could imagine, that barely taking Notice, that *I had set out, in the very Title Page, with a Charge of Craft, of Falshood, and Sophistry*, was a sufficient Refutation of the Truth of that Charge; or supposing it true, yet still sufficient to shew that the publishing of it was inconsistent *with the Rules of good Breeding, or of Christian Charity*? Happily for the World, whatever there may be in your Rules of good Breeding, there never can be any thing in Christian Charity, nor any thing else that is, in reality, Christian, in the least Degree incongruous with Reason and Sense: My principal and professed Purpose, then, having

F

been

been to demonstrate to the Public, that you, and the Author of the *Considerations*, were forced to have recourse to Sophistry and Falshood, and Principles manifestly subversive of all Liberty, in Defence of your Cause; and being fully convinced, that I had fairly and undeniably accomplished that Purpose, what could be a more natural Dictate of plain common Sense, than to acquaint the Reader, in the Title Page, with what the Writer meant to make out to him in the Body of the Pamphlet? You seem to lay some Stress on the Words, '*He sets out in his very Title Page:*' But if this were of any Moment, you could not but know that, though the Title Page is the first Thing presented to the Eye of the Reader, yet, as often as it is intended for a general Index to the Book, it must always be the last Thing that the Writer takes into his Thoughts.

Seeing, then, this very Title Page, comprehending the Burthen of the several particular Charges, must be allowed to have a Right, upon Principles of Common Sense, and consistently with Christian Charity, to stand just as it does; what can it avail you to have recourse to Declarations of your *being conscious to the Uprightness of your own Intentions*? You declare, for Instance, in a very solemn Manner, that your *sole Aim was, to serve the real Interests of your King and Country*: Be it so, had there ever been any Charge brought against you to the contrary; or had ever any Mention been made concerning your final Intention?—But let your ultimate Purpose have been ever so good, can this alter the real Nature of the Means which have been actually employed by you for accomplishing this Purpose? Are not Sophistry and Falshood the same bad Things they were, and alike justly tending to destroy, with the Public, all Confidence and Credit towards the Persons who practise them,
let

let these Persons be ever so conscious to the good Meaning and Uprightness of their own final Intentions? Is it not just the same wrong Thing it was, to have set yourself, by Misrepresentation, to divest some of the best Men of this Kingdom of the Esteem and Confidence of their Country, when they had acted no other Part than what you, on your own Principles, was led necessarily to justify; and to transfer, as far as in you lay, this same popular Esteem on Men, whether in or out of this Kingdom, who acted a Part which no Principles can justify? must not such Partiality be the same injurious Thing it was, tho' you would ever so *much rather* that none of the Servants of the Crown, under his Majesty's Government, should be guilty of invading any of the essential Liberties of this Kingdom?

Consistently, therefore, with your standing convicted of having had recourse to the Arts of Sophistry and Falshood, and of having rested your Cause on the Strength of those Arts, your ultimate Purpose, which is what we must necessarily understand by the Words, 'Your *sole Aim*,' shall, most readily, be admitted by me to have been as laudable as you will, and, so far as the Doctrine of good Intention can do you any Service, you are heartily welcome to enjoy its full Benefit.

But this is a Matter, which your own Reason must shew you, can admit of no Abatement; as the Facts appear'd evident and unquestionable to the Writer, so it was of singular Importance, in so interesting a Controversy, that they should be made equally evident and unquestionable to the Public: To be able to shew that such Men as you were compelled to have recourse to such Arts as

these, for the Support of a Cause, was well nigh equivalent to shewing, that the Cause would not admit of any other Support. Most certain it is, that it must be Necessity, not Choice, which, at any time, determines Men of Sense to quit the plain open Road of Truth and fair Argument.

But, tho' I willingly leave you to enjoy the full Benefit of your Declarations of general good Intention, yet I cannot forbear most earnestly to advise you to let alone, for the future, these solemn Appeals to the Searcher of Hearts! You cannot but know, that this is not Honesty's natural Road for issuing such Controversies. Conscious Innocence is bold, and bids Defiance to its Accuser, calling loudly for Proof, and will not be put off, till it has repelled the Infamy; the other is a Measure suspicious in its Appearance; alike in every Man's Power; and every one knows how prone the unhappy Man is, when he sees all human Evidence has concluded against him, to make his last Effort in behalf of his Character, by appealing to Heaven.

It now only remains to take a little Notice of the Circumstance of having addressed you, in *Truth against Craft*, in the Character of an *old Acquaintance*. If I do not mistake, you would have judged it full as well, had you taken no Notice of so seemingly an insignificant Matter, in your Defence. It is certainly true, that we have been long acquainted; it is, likewise, as certainly true, that, at the very time you were writing your *Case fairly stated*, we had been sitting together, in social Meetings, with all the Appearances of Openness and Familiarity, and of mutual Confidence. Whether the Part you were conscious, you, at that time, were acting in your Closet against

against me, can be made perfectly to accord with the Part you were visibly acting towards me, in those social Interviews, shall still be left to your own Breast to determine, it was to put you on that Determination, that the Epithet was chosen in *Truth against Craft*; but, exclusive of this, did not your Intention to *write fairly* naturally require, that, seeing the Writer of the *Remarks* had, by your own Acknowledgment, given a very fair Account of the Principles upon which a distinct Notion of the Subject of Debate might safely be form'd, Recourse should first have been had to see if what appear'd to you, in the subsequent Part of his Argument, to be inconsistent with this, could not be fairly reconciled? In which Case, all Controversy betwixt you and him, must have been prevented, and, at the same time, you might have had the Chance of getting some of those *big Things* explain'd to you, which you were then conscious to yourself you did not thoroughly understand. In all probability, it might have been well for us both, had you, at that time, descended to have taken this familiar and plain candid Measure: I say, for us both; for, in Truth, it has given me most hearty Concern, first, for having had Cause, and then, for being laid under an unavoidable Necessity, of detecting your Craft, in regard to this Controversy.

I had almost forgot to acknowledge, that there is one thing you mention to the Disadvantage of *Truth against Craft*, which is certainly just: You call it *a tedious Pamphlet, of eighty-six Pages*. Tedious it is, I most freely confess; and had you added the Epithets, Heavy and Spiritless, you should have had my Concurrence. These are not chargeable merely on this Pamphlet, but are generally so many Characteristics of the Productions
of

of the Writer, whether they be long or short; nor do I know any one Article they have to recommend them, but what, I hope, will be always another inseparable Characteristic of every thing he writes, always to speak the Truth, as it is in his Heart, and never to attempt convincing his Neighbour of any thing to the Disadvantage of any Person, or of any Cause, which he is not first fully convinced of himself, and to write only on Subjects where it is of some Importance that Truth should be spoken. He is not ashamed nor afraid to own, that his Design, in some of his Papers, was, to convince the People of this Country, that some of their most important Interests and Rights had been actually in Danger, and that it was by the invincible Fidelity of the Patriots of this Country that they were rescued*. In his Pamphlet of *Facts and Observations*, he gave Intimation of this Danger: That Pamphlet, indeed, met with plentiful Abuse, but it met with no Answer. It could not be answer'd: The Facts it contain'd not only were true, but a farther Inquiry into them, could only have served to disclose farther Matters, which were yet to be concealed.

These Facts, however, were of so interesting and so striking a Nature, that they were sufficient, of themselves, to have excited the Jealousy of every honest Man: They ought, Sir, in all Reason, tho' nothing else had concurred, so far at least to have excited your Jealousy, as to have prevented your becoming so forward a Volunteer in Defence of a Party, before you had made yourself sure that this Party, or their Leaders, were not, in any material Degree, culpable, in

* See p. 14. of the Defence.

respect to these Facts. I have good Reason to know, that you have not arrived at any such Certainty to this very Hour : And this, Sir, is another very unfavourable Symptom of your immediate Inducement in writing your Book. But I ask my Reader's Pardon, for lengthening out his Labour by this unpremeditated Excursion, and now shall conclude with this single Observation, That a fuller Confirmation of the Charges brought against you, in *Truth against Craft*, could not well have been given, than what is manifestly exhibited in this last Instance of your Conduct.

It had been shewn, That, in your *Case fairly stated*, instead of Facts, and fair Argument, you had betaken yourself to the foul Arts of Sophistry and Misrepresentation.

It had likewise been proved, not only with the Form, but the Cogency of the strictest Demonstration, That, would you be true to your own Principles, and act up to the Character of a plain, honest Man, you must abandon your Party, and join with the general Voice of your Country, in doing Honour to the Patriots who rejected the Clause.

It was still farther shewn, That, in direct Opposition of these your own native Principles, the Labour of your Book had been principally employ'd in depriving, as far as in you lay, these same worthy Patriots of that Gratitude and Confidence they had so justly deserved from their Country, and in transferring Honour on the Men, in whose Behalf, at the same time, you had not so much as attempted to assign any one Principle, on which they could, with any shew of probability, be supposed to have acted, consistently with a commanding

commanding Respect to the Rights of this Kingdom ! These several Articles had been clearly made out with suitable Evidence. Have you so much as attempted to refute any one of them ? If you meant what you profess, was not this your main Business ? Instead of which, what have you been doing ? Why, after making Shew of returning to an Argument, which it is hardly possible to form a Belief, that you yourself could, at that time imagine was in the least to the Purpose, have you not had recourse, in Numbers of Instances, which have been clearly pointed out in the Course of this Paper, to the same wretched Arts ; and then, as the most masterly Stroke of the whole, would have the Public to take this Production upon your Word, as a real DEFENCE of *your Case fairly stated !* — I once mentioned Repentance, but it gave you Offence ; I, therefore, now leave you at Liberty to do as you list, and am,

S I R,

Your old Acquaintance,

and

Faithful, Humble Servant,

The Author of TRUTH against CRAFT.

F I N I S.

G DE 58

E R R A T A.

PAGE 6. Line 1. *for* our Author expresses himself, *read* you express yourself. P. 7. L. 23. *for* does, *read* must.